

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of January 7, 2008 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. New claims 31-33 have been added by the present amendment, no claims have been canceled, and claims 1 and 9 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-15, 17, 20-23, and 25-33 are pending in this application upon entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 20, 23, and 25-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,710,605 (Nelson). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the follow reasons.

Amended claim 1 recites, “wherein the computing device is configured to display at least a portion of the EPG on the second display while the video display is concurrently displaying at least a portion of the EPG.” (Emphasis added) The Office Action alleges on page 3 that Nelson discloses concurrently displaying a portion of the EPG on multiple displays at Figure 4 and at column 6, lines 6-8. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The relied-upon section of Nelson is reproduced below:

A ON TV BUTTON
40 allows information on the display 20 to be displayed on
the television screen.

This section of Nelson merely indicates that menu information from the display device can be displayed on a television. However, neither this section nor any other section of Nelson teaches or suggests that portions of an EPG menu are displayed concurrently on the video display and on the separate display device (e.g., television). Indeed, there are many possible ways in which Nelson might display information on the television screen. For example, to name just a few of the possibilities, Nelson’s display 20 might be turned off to save power (col. 6, lines 34-37) when the ON TV BUTTON 40 is selected, or Nelson’s display 20 might be configured to display simple time/date information or videocassette functions (col. 5, lines 35-40) when the ON TV BUTTON 40 is selected to display a different set of data on the television. Thus, it is clearly not implied by the above statement that Nelson’s system would display a portion of an EPG on the video display

while concurrently displaying a portion of the EPG on the second display, as claimed. Rather, the Examiner has apparently reached this conclusion after having benefited from reading Applicant's own disclosure. Accordingly, since Nelson does not disclose or suggest "display[ing] at least a portion of the EPG on the video display while concurrently displaying at least a portion of the EPG on the second display," claim 1 is not anticipated by Nelson.

Independent claims 9 and 17 each recite, "causing at least a portion of the EPG to be displayed on the first video display while concurrently displaying at least a portion of the EPG on the second display." Therefore, for similar reasons to those discussed above in reference to claim 1, Nelson also does not anticipate claims 9 or 17. Dependent claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 20, 23, and 25-30 are thus also not anticipated by Nelson for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims 1, 9, and 17, as well as based on the additional features recited therein.

For example, claims 25-28 each recite displaying the entire EPG on the video display concurrently while displaying the entire EPG on the second display. As discussed above, Nelson merely indicates that some information from the display 20 may be displayed on a television screen, it does not teach or suggest concurrently displaying an EPG on two devices. Thus, Nelson also fails to teach or suggest displaying an entire EPG on the video display concurrently while displaying the entire EPG on the second display, as recited in claim 25-28. Accordingly, claims 25-28 are allowable over Nelson for at least this additional reason.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5-6, 13-14 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,774,926 (Ellis). However, Ellis fails to overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Nelson, in that Ellis also fails to disclose or suggest "display[ing] at least a portion of the EPG on the video display while concurrently displaying at least a portion of the EPG on the second display," as recited in claim 1, or "causing at least a portion of the EPG to be displayed on the first video display while concurrently displaying at least a portion of the EPG on the second display," as recited in claim 9 and 17. Accordingly, dependent claims 5-6, 13-14 and 21-22 are not obvious in view of the purported combination of Nelson and Ellis for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, as well as based on the additional features recited therein.

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 31-33. While Applicants note that new claims 31-33 have not been rejected, the following remarks are submitted in the interest of expediting prosecution.

Claim 31 recites, “wherein the computing device and the video display are configured such that less than the entire EPG is displayed on the video display concurrently while at least a portion of the EPG is displayed on the second display,” and claims 32 and 33 each recite, “displaying less than the entire EPG on the video display concurrently while displaying at least a portion of the EPG on the second display.” Support for these new claim features can be found, for example, in paragraph [0033] of the specification as originally filed. Thus, for similar reasons to those discussed above in reference to claim 1, and in reference to claims 25-28, Nelson does not teach or suggest displaying “less than the entire EPG” on a video display concurrently while displaying the EPG in a second display device. Accordingly, Applicants submit that new claims 31-33 are allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008

By: /Brian J. Brisnehan/
Brian Brisnehan, Registration No. 60,462
1100 13th St. N.W. Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3324
Fax: (202) 824-3001